A THIRD

LETTER

TO

F. *LEWIS SABRAN*, Jesuit;

WHEREIN

The DEFENCE of his CHALLENGE,

CONCERNING

Invocation of Saints,

Is Examined and Confuted.

IMPRIMATUR,
April 10. 1688.
GUIL. NEEDHAM.

LONDON:
Printed for **Ric. Chiswell**, at the *Rose* and *Crown* in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard. MDCLXXXVIII.

A Third Letter to F. Lewis Sabran, *Jeſuit: Wherein the Defence of his Challenge, concerning* Invocation of Saints, *is Examined and Confuted.*

SIR,

THO you are reſolved to break off our Controverſial Correſpondence by Letters, yet I am for keeping to my former method, and for directing this Anſwer to you, ſince you are ſo much concerned in it; and it is wholly intended to convince you of your further miſtakes, and thoſe groſs Errors you have been guilty of, in your pretended *Defence* of your *Challenge* about *Invocation of Saints*.

You begin the Defence with two heavy Complaints, one of which is, That my *Anſwer* to your *Challenge* was ſo tedious in coming out: The other is, That I have abuſed you in it.

The firſt of theſe Complaints is a very pleaſant one; In my laſt Letter to you, I told you that I would undertake the buſineſs of *Invocation*, as ſoon as the Controverſy about St. *Auſtin*, was either ended or dropt, and not ſooner. Upon this I expected when I ſhould hear from you about it, but to no purpoſe; for it ſeems there was nothing further to be ſaid, and you had had enough of that Controverſy: So that after I had waited Six Weeks for your Anſwer, but heard of none, I had reaſon to conclude That Controverſy was ended; and therefore in my Anſwer to the Vindication of the *Nubes Teſtium*, reſolved to give an *Anſwer* alſo to your Challenge.

This is the true ſtate of that buſineſs; and yet with an Air of Confidence becoming your ſelf, the World muſt be told of a tedious expectation of my Anſwer, which had worn out Three Months; whereas the Anſwer to your *Challenge* ſhould not have been waited for three days, could I but have gueſſed that my ſecond Letter had done your buſineſs ſo effectually as I ſince find it hath: But to paſs this impertinent Preface; you next charge me with abuſing you, and ſlandering you in my Anſwer. I am not able to find where this Abuſe and Slanders are; nor can I gueſs what it is there, which deſerves this imputation, unleſs it be, that to prove a Jeſuit to be ignorant, is to ſlander him: If this be the thing (as it muſt be; for I can find nothing elſe to fix it upon) I do plead guilty; and ſince

you have again compell'd me to animadvert upon you, I am reſolv'd to be very free with you, and to ſpeak my mind plainly, tho I find I ſhall quickly fall into the very ſame ſlandering humour; for you have made me a large Proviſion for that purpoſe, and I will not let any piece of it eſcape me.

Well, now we are come to the buſineſs of *Invocation* it ſelf, and you have made ſuch Tragical Work about it, as if Invocation of Saints, and Chriſtianity, were to ſtand and fall together; as if we that oppoſe Invocation of Saints, were enemies to the Saints in Glory, had denied the Chriſtians common Creed, were contrary to the Catholick Militant Church; and, which is worſt of all, had called God's Veracity into queſtion. This is terrible ſtuff, and I queſtion not but that it takes mightily among the Women of your Party; but I am afraid is quite loſt upon our people, who will certainly laugh at ſuch wretched ſtuff, as knowing very well, that the true Church of God did never practice Invocation of Saints; and that the Creed did no more teach it, than the Worſhipping of Idols, or Tranſubſtantiation; but you are one of thoſe, that ſo you may but gain your end of frighting people to continue with, or come over to you, never boggle at the moſt unjuſt, and the moſt abſurd means of doing it.

I do not in the leaſt wonder at your talking at this extravagant rate; I cannot but remember that you appeared with the ſame confident bluſtering in the defence of the forged 35*th* Sermon of St. *Auſtin*; that you made as much noiſe, and talked to the Proteſtant Peer with as much aſſurance, as if it had been the certaineſt thing in the World, that the Sermon was St. *Auſtins*, and that I was an impudent ignorant fellow for offering to deny it: But after all that ſtorm, the World remembers, and I hope that Lord was ſatisfied too, That it was the moſt Impudent Controverſy that ever was attempted by any Man, to defend that Sermon; and that it was defended with Arguments and Authorities that every Scholar would have been aſhamed of. What ado had we with S. *Hierom*, *Hephonſus*, *Mallion*'s Sermon, with *Nicephorus*'s *Juvenal*, every one of which were the moſt wretched Forgeries that could have been pickt up. What a paſs were things brought to in the *Reply*, when you were for denying your own words about S. *Bernard*, for eating up thoſe about the *Aſſumption ſignifying the day of the Saints Death*; and for aſſerting that the *Louvain Divines* had not left the 18*th* Sermon *de Sanctis*, as *doubtful*. Never was Cauſe managed with more Impudence and more Forgeries, and yet after all your confidence at firſt, and bluſtering throughout, it was dropt as quietly as if no ſuch thing had ever been, and in your new Defence not a ſyllable of it, or in Anſwer to my Second Letter, which it ſeems now muſt never have one.

I muſt tell you, Sir, that the Management of that Controverſie about St. *Auſtins* Sermon, hath prepared me to expect juſt ſuch ſtuff at your hands whenſoever you ſhould ſet up for Writer again; and you have not deceived my expectation, for you begin this Controverſie about Invocation, with the very ſame aſſurance that you did the other, and you manage it with downright Forgeries altogether as bad as the other were; as I will quickly ſhew you.

It was ſo trifling a Concern to anſwer your Cavilling demands, in your Letter to the *Proteſtant Peer* about Invocation, that had I not had the opportunity of tacking it to my Defence of the Anſwer to the *Nubes Teſtium*, I ſhould never have troubled the world or my ſelf with it. And when I had perſwaded my ſelf to anſwer that Challenge, it was my next care to make it as uſeful to the Reader as the thing was capable of. To this purpoſe, as well as to have ſtopt your Cavilling for the future, I did enlarge my deſign, and ſhewed through the firſt Centuries down to St. *Auſtin*, that the Doctrine as well as the Practice of the Primitive Fathers were directly againſt your Invocation; after this I anſwered all your Objections, and then aſſigned the Differences betwixt what is now practiſed and taught in the Church of *Rome*, and what was beginning to be practiſed in the end of the Fourth Century as to Invocation to the Saints.

It was but reaſonable for me who had particularly anſwered every one of your Authorities and Objections, to have expected the ſame favour at your hands; but this is a kindneſs which you and your Party are too cunning to uſe us to. When I had firſt anſwered thoſe Objections as they lay in the *Nubes Teſtium*, I did expect you would have given them an Anſwer; but as if nothing had been ever ſaid to them, you only gave them us over again: Such uſage was very provoking; however I prevailed with my ſelf to give them a ſecond and fuller anſwer; and what muſt I expect in requital to this? why, we are here preſented with 'em a third time, as if you had never ſeen my two Anſwers to them.

And is this ingenuous dealing? what muſt we call trifling, if this be not it in the higheſt degree? for ſhame, Sir, leave off ſuch pitiful dealing; if you be not able to defend or to anſwer for them, be prevailed with to have ſo much modeſty as to let them lye ſtill; I am very well ſatisfied that you are not, and therefore for the Reader's and the world's ſake let us have no more of ſuch *Crambe*; but if you cannot go on, e'ne leave off.

And this, Sir, is certainly the true reaſon, why you let my Hiſtorical Account againſt Invocation paſs without one ſyllable of Anſwer to it, or to my Confutation of your Objections. You tell the Reader

you will only conſider 13 Pages of it at preſent; but Sir, count again, and you will find that you muſt take 12 out of your 13, for it is but one ſingle Page that you have ventured upon, notwithſtanding your brag at the beginning; and that is the 78 Page, which aſſigns the three Differences betwixt the Church of *Rome*, and the Fathers of the End of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries. The firſt of which was, that the Church of *Rome* doth uſe a direct Invocation, or formal Prayer to the Saints and Angels; whereas the Fathers who began the Cuſtom near St. *Auſtins* time [the time in Controverſie betwixt us] uſed meerly ſuch addreſſes and requeſts as are made from one Friend to another; which I proved from their own words.

In anſwer to this, you ſay, *The Fathers of the Fifth and Fourth Century and* UPWARDS, *offered with as formal an Invocation, as humble, ſubmiſſive and devout prayer to the Saints in Heaven, as any that are in preſent uſe amongſt Catholicks.* This, Sir, I will own to be very home againſt me; and the proving of this, as well as the ſaying of it, ſhould end this part of the Controverſie; but can you do as well as ſay theſe things? Yes ſure, or you would not have bid us in the next words to take a *few inſtances of matter of fact in lieu of an* INFINITY *that could be produced.*

Well, Sir, for a Promiſer, and for an Undertaker, I never did meet, nor ever ſhall again with your match. This is down-right Rhodomontadoing, and the man that could but do half as much as you can promiſe, would be the greateſt man the Church of *Rome* ever had. But are things to be carried at this rate at this time of the day? I am aſhamed that any man that pretends to have lookt into Books, ſhould talk at ſuch an extravagant and ſo abſurd a rate, and ſhould aſſert things ſo wretchedly falſe, without the leaſt ſign of bluſhing at it.

But ſince you ſay you can do it, I come now to try thoſe you offer, and will not ſtand with you for the fifth Century; but deſire, as I expected, and challenged you to ſhew from the *Fourth Century upwards*, ſome proofs of this extravagant promiſe, from the firſt, ſecond or third Century.

You begin with St. *Athanaſius*, but I pray which of the three Centuries did he live in? You undertake for the Fourth Century and Upwards, but forgetting your ſelf within ſix lines of it, your meaning of the *Fourth Century and Upwards*, proves to be the *Fourth Century and Downwards*; for St. *Athanaſius* who lived in the middle of the *Fourth Century*, is the firſt and the moſt ancient of all the Fathers you offer us; and is not this very fine? this comes of talking without Book, and bluſtring, as if confidence would do the buſineſs it ſelf. But after all, is St. *Athanaſius* himſelf for you? You quote him

here

here out of his Tract *de Incarnatione Verbi.* Alas, Sir, it was always ominous to ſtumble at the firſt; and this is your fate, tho you, I dare ſay for you, are far from knowing it; for this Tract is own'd by your lateſt Critick * not to be St. *Athanaſius*'s; ſo that your firſt Author is a Forgery.

* *Du Pin Nouvelle Bibliotb. Tom 2. pa. 117.*

But ſuppoſing this Tract to be his, let us next ſee whether he vouches for what you bring him; you quote him firſt laying this ground for his practice: *If you worſhip the man Chriſt, becauſe the Word of God dwells there, at the ſame time worſhip alſo the Saints on Gods account, who hath his dwelling in them*; and then offering a large *Prayer to the Virgin Mary.*

I muſt own my ſelf to have been ſurprized at this account of Saint *Athanaſius*, and therefore I can aſſure you I went ſtraight to *Athanaſius*'s Works, and quickly found your words here to be one of the moſt Scandalous abuſes of an Authors words that I ever read; the paſſage is directly againſt what you produced it for. The *Tract* was written againſt *Samoſatenus*'s Diſciples, who would allow our Bleſſed Saviour to be only a meer man, and denied the Union of the Divinity to the Humanity; they would allow that God deſcending from Heaven dwelt in him; but this the Author of the Tract rejects, becauſe this would make (ſays he) *no difference betwixt Chriſt and the reſt of Chriſtians*, concerning whom the Scripture brings in God ſaying, *that he would dwell in them*; and that he might further ſhew the Abſurdity of that Hereſie, he brings in the very paſſage you quote, and concludes it thus, *Wherefore if you worſhip the Man Chriſt together with God, becauſe God dwells in him, worſhip alſo the Saints together with God, for he dwells in them alſo:* AND IS NOT THIS ABSURD?

With what face then, Sir, could you bring this paſſage to teach the Worſhip of Saints, when the Author deſigned to ridicule the Worſhip of *Chriſt* himſelf, had he been a *meer man*; and had ſpoke his ſenſe plain enough to be directly againſt any Worſhip of the Saints, when he concluded the paſſage with an AND IS NOT THIS ABSURD? which paſſage your *Paris Edition* of *Athanaſius* hath left out in the Tranſlation.

All the Defence you can make here, will be to tell me, that tho you miſtook the ſenſe of that paſſage, yet that the Prayer to the Virgin *Mary*, ſo full and ſo direct, will make amends for all, and that there is no danger of miſtaking the ſenſe of it. This Plea I would have admitted, had but the Prayer it ſelf been there, but the greater miſchief is, that there is not one Syllable of the Prayer in the whole Tract, nor any thing either near or like to it: And are not you, Sir, then a pleaſant Man, that can venture upon theſe things, with ſo much

much Ignorance and Confidence together? if you know nothing of theſe things, why do you meddle with them? Why do you not employ your ſelf about ſomething that you are fitter for? Theſe things lye, I perceive, quite out of your way; and you have quite miſtaken the buſineſs, if you think to bear us down with dint of Confidence in theſe things.

I cannot forgive you this horrid blunder, and this vile abuſe of *Athanaſius*'s words, ſince I might have expected to have prevented this, by what I had ſhewed you from St. *Athanaſius* himſelf ſo lately; who affirmed ſo plainly that *one would not pray to receive any thing from the Father and the* ANGEL, *or from* ANY OF THE OTHER CREATURES (*b*): but it ſeems nothing can either cure or prevent ſome mens affected Stupidity.

(b) *Prim. Fathers no Papiſts*, p. 56.

You next quote St. *Cyril*'s Prayer to the Virgin *Mary in his own name, and of the* WHOLE *General Council of* Epheſus: I would fain know, Sir, where you pick up ſuch ſtuff; do you invent them your ſelf, or is there ſome Office among you for ſuch purpoſes? That Sermon was no more made, nor the Prayer in the Name of the WHOLE General Council of *Epheſus*, than it was in the name of the Council of *Trent*: The Title of it not only in *Labbe*'s Edition of the Councils, but in St. *Cyril*'s works themſelves, is a *Sermon preached at* Epheſus *againſt* Neſtorius, *when* SEVEN [*Biſhops*] *went down to St.* Maries *Church there.* In their names it was, and not as you falſly aſſert, in the names of the whole Council of *Epheſus*; that *Cyril* in the Homily in his Allegorical way doth ſalute (not pray, as you again as falſly aſſert) the *Virgin Mary.* The Salutation it ſelf can do you no ſervice, without the helping-hand of a falſe Tranſlation, nor with it neither, ſo unhappy is your choice of places to prove *Invocation*; for tho I ſhould let paſs your making *Cyril* ſay, *Hail Virgin, by whoſe Mediation the Holy Trinity is glorified and honoured through the whole world; in whom Heaven exults*; all that this could prove, is that *Cyril* held that the Virgin interceded for them; but all this is foul dealing, there is not a Syllable of *Mediation* here, for all the expreſſions here do plainly refer to the *Virgins holy Womb*, as will appear by a *juſt Tranſlation* of the words. *Hail thou that didſt bear him that is incomprehenſible in thy Holy Virgin-Womb*; δι' ὃν, *by which*, or by *reaſon of which* (not *by whoſe Mediation*) *the Trinity is glorified*; δι' ὃν *by reaſon of which* (not *in whom* as you falſly) *heaven rejoices.* This is enough to ſhew to how falſe a purpoſe this place was produced, when the very falſe Tranſlation it ſelf could not ſerve your turn.

Your next Author is *Gregory Nyſſen*, but this I have anſwered twice already, and will not dance after you any more. *Gregory Nazianzen* follows,

lows, but to little purpoſe; for every Body is ſatsified, but ſuch as you that know nothing of him, but by a borrowed Quotation, that he indulges himſelf in a Rhetorical way ſometimes of talking to Churches and Cities, and ſtone Walls, as well as to Saints; but no Body takes this for invocating of Churches; and for the other we know whence he borrowed it, even from the Heathen Orators; however for all his familiar talk in ſome of his Orations (for in them only it is) to the Saints, he did not believe that they could hear him; this is plain from his ὁ τις ἀθεος to *Conſtantius*, and other Paſſages in him.

And now we are got downwards inſtead of upwards, and are got quite paſt S. *Auſtin*'s time, to which I refer'd you, and about which our Contention was; ſo that I need trouble my ſelf about no Anſwer to your *Maximus*'s Sermon upon S. *Agnes*, which is made up of a great deal of the ſame Stuff, and with ſome that is worſe than that 90th Sermon in S. *Ambroſe* upon the ſame Saint, which is owned by all Learned Men to be groſly ſpurious and very fulſome. Nor need I anſwer your next Example from *Hilary* of *Arles*'s Life of *Honoratus* (whom you call *Honorius*) whom he does not pray to, but deſire as he was their Patron, to continue ſo; which ſpeaks no more than that Interceſſion which was then believed.

Your *Nectarius* upon *Theodore*, and Prayer to him, is certainly ſpurious; and tho I have not been able to get a ſight of the Book, yet I am able to prove it a forgery from the very Quotation it ſelf, which you produce, wherein *Nectarius* is brought in praying to *Theodore*, That *he would defend them from the Aſſaults of* Julian, *the Enemy of Mankind*. Now had you known any thing of Chronology, you might have ſeen this your ſelf, *Julian* was made Emperor 361. and was kill'd in his Wars within two years; this was 19 years before *Nectarius* was a Chriſtian, who was while a Catechumen, call'd to be Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* 381. and therefore no ſuch Oration againſt *Julian* could be made by him, ſince *Julian* was in his Grave ſo many years before.

You next boaſting tell us you could have given us the *fervent Prayers to the Virgin* Mary, of *S.* Methodius, Ephrem Syrus, Athanaſius *and* Leo: I wiſh you had, that ſo we might have had all your forged ſpurious Authors together, for ſuch theſe are, as to thoſe peices you allude to. But however, to keep your hand in, you are for letting us have one, and you cannot omit *Gregory Nazianzen*'s Prayer to the Virgin *Mary* out of his Poetry. It is pity that this Poetry is none of *Gregory*'s own; but if it were, do you think we will be content with your proving Invocation of Saints to be lawful, out of Poetry, where no Poet can be in the mode without calling upon his Muſe?

You are reſolved next to diſpatch me throughly, and therefore you'l prove that the Ancients uſed the term Invocation it ſelf, to the Saints. This is very terrible, and you begin as luckily with *Gregory Nazianzen*'s Oration upon *Theodore*; but with your good leave, *Sir*, you were too haſty here, for *Gregory Nazianzen* hath no ſuch Oration upon that Saint; and therefore, you muſt look again. You next play S. *Baſil* upon me, who you ſay had precendency in Death of *Gregory Nazianzen*; but where muſt I find what you quote? You neither cite Book nor Volume; muſt I then go turn over three large Folio's, to find out one ſimple Line, that you pretend to quote from him? This is too much ill-natur'd, and too hard; and makes me highly ſuſpect that this ſilly Paſſage is no more in S. *Baſil*'s Works, than the former in *Gregory Nazianzen*'s.

A third, I muſt have, however to make up the matter from S. *Auſtin*, who upon *Jacob*'s words, that his Name ſhould be named on the Lads, had obſerved that the word *Invocation*, as well as *Exaudition*, is uſed in reference to Men, as well as God; but to what purpoſe is all this? Is not the ſenſe plain enough, that all he means is, that the word Invocation is uſed in a civil Reſpect to Men, as well as in a religious reſpect to God? and hath not this very Father fully ſecur'd us from taking it as to men in a religious Senſe, when in his Book, *De Civit. Dei* † he tells us, That the Martyrs names indeed were recited during the Divine Service, but that they were not INVOCATED by the Prieſt who did officiate.

† Aug. de Civ. d. l. 22. c. 10.

But notwithanding the Vanity of your Attempt here, you prefac't it with a luſty Bravado, That *you could cite me all the* HOLY FATHERS ALPHABETICALLY *practicing and recommending Invocations of Saints, in the very term.*

And are not you a pleaſant Man, *Sir*? does not your own Conſcience tell you, That this is the moſt extravagant, and moſt impoſſible Attempt that ever man undertook? if it do not, I will then aſſure you, and prove it when you pleaſe, that this abſurd Brag did proceed from an Ignorance ſo great, that it can be matched with nothing but the Confidence with which you have ſo vainly undertaken an impoſſible thing. But ſince you have ſuch an Aſſurance, and dare venture upon ſuch promiſes of an Alphabetical Catalogue of all the Fathers, practiſing and recommending it in the very term; I challenge you to produce that Catalogue in the next Sheet you threaten; I Challenge you to ſhew me but one of that Catalogue that is genuine for the three firſt Ages; ſo certain I am, that you have undertaken a thing that you know nothing of.

You are next for anſwering St. *Paul*'s Authority againſt Invocation of Saints, *How ſhall they invocate or call upon him, in whom they have not believed?* And tell us, you are *aſhamed to ſuggeſt an Anſwer to the meaneſt of your Readers. Aſhamed*, do you ſay? This I am mighty glad to meet with, and cannot but congratulate the very hopes of Modeſty in you. Well, but you ſay, *Tho no one can invocate God as God, who believes not in him; yet is every one that is invocated, believed to be God.* No, God forbid; but this we ſay, That no one ought to be invocated, but he that is believed to be God, and that is not only S. *Paul*'s Senſe here, but was the Senſe of all the Fathers againſt the *Jews* and *Arians*, who always inſiſted upon it, as a certain Argument of Chriſt's being God, in that *he was invocated*, which no Creature was capable of. This I have abundantly ſhewn in my Anſwer to your Challenge from *Origen*, who makes *Invocation* and *Adoration* the ſame, from S. *Athanaſius*, and *Epiphanius*, and others, that Chriſt could not have been invocated, except he were God; but all this it ſeems, is loſt upon you, as much as thoſe Arguments of the Fathers would have been then, had Saints been invocated as well as Chriſt. But to paſs ſuch trifling arguing, and your parallel betwixt the Love of God, and this Invocation; I will now paſs with you to the *ſecond Difference* aſſigned, which was, That *thoſe Requeſts were made at the Memories of thoſe Martyrs to whom they were preſented, and who were believed to be preſent, tho inviſible at the ſame time; but the Invocations of Saints in the Church of* Rome *in every place, to a particular Saint in ten thouſand diſtant places at the ſame time.* Which I then ſaid, and ſay here again, is to aſcribe to the Saints an *Omnipreſence*, an Attribute that none of them is capable of.

The practice of your own Church herein, you dare not deny, that they are thus ſuperſtitiouſly guilty of praying to any Saint in ſuch diſtant places at the ſame time; your care is to make the Fathers of the end of the 4*th* and 5*th* Century as guilty, by diſproving what I had laid down of their putting up thoſe Requeſts at the Memories of the Martyrs; but, how I pray? In proving *it unanſwerably moſt falſe*, what I there aſſert? this is great, and like your ſelf. And you began with S. *Auſtin*, who having in the 15*th* Chapter of the Book you quote, aſſerted, *That the Dead know nothing of what is done below on Earth*, was put to it, how to ſolve the Objection of the Martyrs helping thoſe that Addreſſed to them at their Memories; and concludes it paſt his underſtanding to ſolve it, how they could do it; whether or no they be preſent in ſo different places at once. If it was paſt his underſtanding to ſolve it, it had certainly been his beſt way not to have medled with a

thing which had no certainty, and which no finite Nature was capable of.

You quote next *Gregory Nazianzen*, in his Sermon before Fifty Biſhops: It was before 150 Biſhops; and tho' I have not time to read over that long Sermon, yet I have good reaſon, by the caſting of my eye upon it, to believe that your quotation is not there; but ſuppoſe it is, How is it againſt me, when it only ſays, That where the *Martyrs Bodies only are, the ſame effect is had as from their Souls?* This is directly for me, but your ignorance is too great to let you ſee it.

S. *Ambroſe* is next quoted in *Natali S. Naz. & Celſi*; but there is no ſuch thing in his Works, in the Edition of *Froben*, which I uſe; nor does *Bellarmin*, in his *de Scriptoribus*, mention any ſuch Tract; ſo that I have great reaſon to give you thanks for the great civility of making me turn over Five Tomes, to look for a wretched Forgery, which could find no place there.

To finiſh your doughty proofs unanſwerably, you laſt bring *Gregory*'s Dialogues; but he is too far off to be concerned here, and was Two hundred years after S. *Auſtin*.

But here, as tho conſcious that theſe unanſwerable proofs would be found trifles, you begin again, and will prove it further againſt me from *Gregory Naz. Jambic. de Veritat.*

You accuſe me here of citing Fathers I never ſaw; but I believe I ſhall quickly find that ſomebody elſe does it, tho I do not; for I honeſtly went to *Gregory*'s Works, and do here tell you, that the piece you quote here is not in his Works. And is not this very becoming you? I do not know what name to give ſuch behaviour, when a Man ſhall have the face to accuſe another, and falſly too, of that very thing which he himſelf is guilty of in this very place: But I begin to deſpair of doing any good upon you, and look upon you in the ſtate of thoſe who can be guilty of the worſt things, without the expence of one bluſh.

You are after this, for giving me again a piece of *Theodoret*; but this I have anſwered twice already, and therefore will paſs it; and S. *Auſtin*'s Story about S. *Stephen*'s Reliques, of which, had I room, I would give the Reader a very diverting account about their being found; but neither it, nor the paſſage it ſelf is to our purpoſe: And the next from *Bede* is far leſs, about S. *German*'s carrying ſome Reliques about him; ſo that I muſt take leave of your unanſwerable Arguments, which were able to prove juſt nothing, but the extravagant Confidence and Ignorance of him that brought them.

The

The Third Difference I offered was, That thoſe Requeſts and Interpellations to the Martyrs, begun at the end of the fourth Century, were neither commanded by the Primitive Church, authorized by her Councils, nor uſed in her Publick Offices; but that on the contrary, the Prayers to Saints in the Church of *Rome*, are injoined by that Church, are authorized by her Council of *Trent*, and uſed in her publick Offices, and in the moſt ſolemn part of them.

Here you are grown very angry, and deſire me to ſhew any Canon of the Council of *Trent*, or of any other, that commands Prayers to Saints as an obligation of Catholick Faith: But why all this Anger, and all this Shifting? Is there then any danger or hurt in thoſe Invocations of Saints, that you ſhould be ſo ſhy of its being believed that your Church commands them? Ay; But, ſay you, where does it command them as an obligation of Catholick Faith? This it is to be afraid of ones own ſhadow, and to be ſo cautious as to run into Nonſenſe; who elſe would talk of a matter of Practice's being commanded as an obligation of Catholick Faith? Cannot your Church enjoyn the Bleſſing of Bells, without making it an obligation of Catholick Faith? But to paſs this frightful Nonſence? Does not your Church enjoyn the uſe of the Breviaries and Offices? Upon whoſe Authority are they uſed among you? Did not the Council of *Trent* ſufficiently authoriſe them, when it appointed the Reforming of the Breviaries? You will not ſay that was to ſtrike out the Prayers to Saints; you cannot be ſo ridiculous, and you needed not have been ſo over-cautious about nothing. No one can be married in our Church without the uſe of the Ring, and yet no body looks for, or demands a Canon of our Church for the uſe of it.

But we have next a very great rarity, and it ſeems my Aſſertion is very falſe, That no Councils in the Primitive Church did authoriſe Praying to Saints; you could have given us many Proofs, but are ſtraitned it ſeems, and ſo can give us but two or Three: I hope theſe choice ones will prove of the beſt ſort, and be very convincing. You begin with the General Council of *Chalcedon*, which was not held till after St. *Auſtin* had been twenty years in his Grave. This Council, you tell us, authoriſed Invocation of Saints by practiſing it: And did it ſo? Why then how comes it to paſs, that the Church of *Rome* does not authoriſe Invocation of Saints, by practiſing it? How comes the Council of *Trent* not to authoriſe the *Romiſh* Breviary, which was certainly uſed by them a Thouſand times during their Seſſions? But ſome men are ſo fierce, and ſo forgetful, that they cannot remember their own Method of Arguing, for ten lines together: Well, but did that great Council practiſe it? You tell us *that theſe were their*

words

words, and the general voice of all thoſe holy Biſhops there aſſembled, Behold the Truth, Flavianus lives after Death, that the Martyr pray for us. I was paſt wondring at you, or elſe I ſhould admire ſo much Fraud and Falſhood crouded together in ſo little room: It is falſe that thoſe words were the voice of all the Council, or that they did Invocate the Martyr that uſed them; and it is as falſe, that theſe ſet down are the words uſed. The true account of the buſineſs is this; *Baſſianus*, who had been ejected out of his *Biſhoprick* of *Epheſus*, put in his appeal to the *Council* againſt *Stephen* then Biſhop of that See; the matter was heard, and whatever both could ſay for themſelves; it was urged for *Baſſianus* among other things, that *Flavianus* of *Conſtantinople* had communicated with him; upon this the *Biſhops* and *Clergy* that belonged to *Conſtantinople*, roſe up, and cried out, *This is the Truth, we all ſay the ſame, the Memory of* Flavian *is eternal, behold the Truth,* Flavian *lives after Death; the Martyr ſhall entreat you for us,* Flavian *is here,* Flavian *judges with us.* From all which it is plain, that the words ſo much inſiſted on, plainly refer to *Flavian* as judging for *Baſſian*, and *entreating the Council* with the *reſt* on *Baſſian*'s *ſide*; not a ſyllable here of Invocation to him; and yet this is the place your ſide have ſo often urged, and hath been ſo often anſwered.

The Council of *Gangræ* you next produce, but quite miſtake the deſign of it, to make your Ignorance more and more notorious. All Learned Men own the *Council* was called againſt the *Diſciples* of *Euſtathius*, who were guilty of that groſs Error, mentioned by St. *Paul*, of *forbidding to marry*; and were ſo ſet againſt it, that they would not Communicate with Married people, would not receive the *Euchariſt* at the hands of a Married Prieſt; but deſpiſed not only them, but the *Chriſtian Aſſemblies*, the *Memories* of the *Martyrs*, and the *Faſts* of the *Church*; and appear to be a people, who made it their buſineſs to be directly contrary to the reſt of *Chriſtians*.

The *Council* was called to condemn this Hereſie, and in their 20*th* Canon which you quote, they *condemn any one that through Pride, and deteſting them, ſhould accuſe the Aſſemblies where the Martyrs lye, or the Divine Offices which are performed there, or the Memories of the Martyrs.* And what is all this to *Invocation of Saints*? Is it commanded here, or is it mentioned here, or any thing like it? You were forced to help the place a little, by adding your wiſe Note to the beginning of it; when having tranſlated it, *if any one through Pride, as believing himſelf perfect*, you add, *that is, not needing the Interceſſion of Saints*: But there is no need to expoſe the folly of this addition, the very reading of it is ſufficient to ſhew the miſerable ſhifts you are put to, when you meddle with theſe things.

The

The Council of *Laodicea*'s *6th* and *34th* Canon are urged next by you, but they are certainly urged by one that never read them, except in *Caranza* or *Coccius*, or ſome ſuch Writers: The *6th* Canon orders, that *Hereticks ſhall not be permitted to go to God's Houſe, as long as they continue in their Hereſie:* And is this a *Canon*, Sir, for *Invocation of Saints?* it would have ſerved fully as well to prove that the *Council* of *Trent* was held in the *laſt Century*; and that *Innocent* the *11th.* is now *Pope* at *Rome.* The *34th.* forbids *any Chriſtian to leave the true Martyrs of Chriſt, and to make Aſſemblies at the Memories of falſe or Heretical Martyrs.* Here is no more mention of, or command for *Invocation* of *Saints*, than there is in the *firſt Chapter* of *Geneſis*; and yet this Council muſt be drag'd in for the proof, and for the Authorizing of *Invocation of Saints*, which in the *very next Canon* does condemn the INVOCATION OF ANGELS [and conſequently of *Saints*, for the reaſon of the *Canon* holds *equally* againſt *both*] as IDOLATRY, and a FORSAKING OF CHRIST. This is a very bold attempt; and this ſhews that you dare venture upon any the moſt abſurd of things; and I am not able to make any other Apology for you, than that this Council was quoted for *Invocation of Saints* by you out of the abundance of your ignorance. But I muſt recant this excuſe, ſince if you read my Book againſt you, that *Canon* could not eſcape you. I know not what to ſay for you: I look upon you to be the moſt daring, and yet the unhappieſt man that ever put Pen to Paper. You have ſtill one other *Council* for us, the *5th.* of *Carthage*, which has not one word to your purpoſe any more than the reſt. All it orders is, that *Chriſtians ſhould not aſſemble at any Church where there were not ſome Martyrs Reliques.* But ſuch proofs as theſe, tho nothing to the purpoſe, we muſt be content with, when a man undertakes a thing for which there is no colour.

St. *Auſtin*'s expreſs Teſtimony that the *Martyrs were not Invocated*, we have had already, ſo that we need not trouble our ſelves about him; and now you have brought us to your laſt undertaking, to ſhew that the *Fathers in the Liturgies had as formal Prayers to Saints, as your Church hath.* You do well to wave the *Liturgies of St. Peter, James* and *Mark*, &c. ſince they are confeſſed Forgeries; but upon the ſame reaſon you ſhould not have troubled us with St. *Baſil*'s, or St. *Chryſoſtom*'s, ſince they are not *genuine*, but have been *interpolated.* However what you bring from them, proves only that they believed that *the Virgin Mother interceded for them*; which is nothing to the purpoſe of proving that in the *Ancient Liturgies ſolemn Prayers were put up to the Saints*, ſuch as now are uſed by *your Church.*

The paſſage from St. *Cyril* (allowing that Catechiſm to be his) proves not one jot further, than the belief of the *Saints Interceſſion* for thoſe

thoſe on Earth. And St. *Auſtin*'s does but the very ſame; ſo that after all this Confidence, and bold Undertaking, you have not been able to produce *one Canon* of *any Council* for *Invocation of Saints*, nor *one line* of a *Prayer* to the *Saints*, out of any *ancient*, *genuine*, no nor *Interpolated Liturgies*.

You have but another Proof to offer from *Pelagius* the *Second*, but he comes two hundred years too late; and yet all he ſpeaks for, or *Leo* alludes to, is, that they believed the Saints Interceſſion for thoſe on earth; and is there no difference between the Saints interceding for us, and our praying to them? You have been often enough told there is: Have you neither Memory nor Judgment, that theſe things muſt be always confounded? And when you ſhould prove the *Invocation of Saints*, you fall to proving that the *Saints intercede for you*. I heartily pity you, that nothing can do good upon you; I pity you the more, that you ſeem in the end of your Paper to believe, that you *have ſatisfied all unprepoſſeſſed and unbiaſſed Readers with ſuch Arguments* as had not one grain of reaſon in them: But I pity you moſt of all, for being employed about ſuch things, and yet to be no better furniſhed by thoſe who ſet you on work, but to be left ſo lamentably to the mercy of him that anſwers you; to be ſuffered to quote nothing but *Forgeries* right, and the *genuine works* of the *Fathers* quite wrong, was a very cruel task; and I am almoſt tempted to believe that it was a Penance impoſed upon you, to help to mortifie ſome proud ſtubborn humour. Alas, Sir, now I am pitying you, I cannot but give you a little good advice, Not to be put upon theſe things by them, to be made a laughing-ſtock to the world, in obedience to them: you have done enough already; if ſuch things muſt be done, why muſt the whole burden lye upon you?

But if all this will not cure you, but that I muſt loſe ſuch good Counſel upon you; and that you will obſtinately continue in your own way, let me beg this at laſt from you, That you will look into the Fathers themſelves, which you quote, and give us *Edition* as well as *Book*; if you will not, this I promiſe you, That I will never anſwer you, but that if you trouble the world with ſuch another Paper as this I now have under my hands, you ſhall e'en anſwer it your ſelf, for I know how to employ to better purpoſes, your Chriſtian Friend.

FINIS.

228519